



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/961,308	09/25/2001	Andrew L. DiRienzo	AIC-008US	8424
27073	7590	05/31/2007	EXAMINER	
LEFFERT JAY & POLGLAZE, P.A. P.O. BOX 581009 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55458-1009			PAULA, CESAR B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2178	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/31/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/961,308	DIRIENZO, ANDREW L.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	CESAR B. PAULA	2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 February 2007.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 100-169 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 100-169 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to RCE amendments filed 1/26, and 2/6/2007.

This action is made **Non-Final**.

2. In the amendment, claims 100-169 have been added, and are pending in the case. Claims 100, 105, and 138 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The rejections to claims 51, 62, 68, 90 and 97 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. The rejections to claims 47-99 under 35 U.S.C. 101 have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for

patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. *Claims 100-102, 104, 136-138, and 168-169 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by "Using Paradox 5 for Windows" QUE, 1994, pp.181-233.*

Regarding independent claim 100, Paradox discloses a design layout box for creating a form, containing various disjointed fields-- *to present a graphical user interface (GUI) comprising two disjoint sets of labeled fields, a first set and a second set, wherein both the first and second sets are non-empty sets* (pages 184-187, 191-197, fig.8.1).

Moreover, Paradox teaches saving the generated form. The form contains descriptive textual read-only fields, and blank spaces to accept input data from a user into those spaces --*to generate a file from data entered into at least some of the labeled fields, to define, responsive to first data entered into the first set of labeled fields, a first subset and a second subset of the second set of labeled fields, wherein the first subset of the second set of labeled fields is allowed to accept second data and the first subset of the second set of labeled fields contains at least one labeled field, and wherein the second subset of the second set of labeled fields is inhibited from accepting data, and wherein the generated file is comprised of individually identifiable data fields filled with the first data and of individually identifiable data fields filled with the second data* (pages 229-230, 184-187, fig.8.1, 8.2).

Regarding claim 101, which depends on claim 100, Paradox teaches saving the generated form. The form contains descriptive textual read-only fields -- *the first set of labeled fields contains one field* (pages 229-230, 184-187, fig.8.1, 8.2).

Regarding claim 102, which depends on claim 100, Paradox teaches saving the generated form. The form contains descriptive textual read-only fields, such as address, contact fields, having two fields-- *the first set of labeled fields contains two fields* (pages 229-230, fig.8.1).

Regarding claim 104, which depends on claim 100, Paradox teaches saving the generated form. The form is filled in by the system using data, such as today's date (pages 224, fig.8.1).

Regarding claim 136, which depends on claim 105, Paradox teaches saving the generated form. The form contains descriptive textual read-only fields, such as address, contact fields, and blank spaces for inputting data-- *the generated file is comprised of individually identifiable data fields filled with the first data and of individually identifiable data fields filled with the second data and wherein there is a one-to-one mapping between the filled labeled fields of the GUI and the filled individually identifiable fields of the file* (pages 229-230, fig.8.1).

Regarding claim 137, which depends on claim 105, Paradox teaches saving the generated form. The form contains descriptive textual read-only fields, such as address, contact fields, and blank spaces for inputting data-- *the identity of each of the individually identifiable fields is*

determined based on its position relative to the other fields in the file, all of said fields being in a predetermined order in the file (pages 229-230, fig.8.1).

Claims 138, and 168-169 are directed towards a computer equivalent to the computer found in claims (100, 105), and 136-137 respectively, and are therefore similarly rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 103, 105-121, 124-135, 139-153, and 156-167 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paradox as applied to claim 100 above, and further in view of Kessler et al (Pat. 5324077, filed on 11/1992).

Regarding claim 103, which depends on claim 102, Paradox teaches saving the generated form. The form contains descriptive textual read-only fields, such as address, contact fields, having two fields (pages 229-230, fig.8.1). Paradox fails to explicitly disclose *the first set of labeled fields contains two fields with one of the fields identifying a health insurance payer and one of the fields identifying a medical procedure*. However, Kessler teaches a form containing insurance, and diagnostic code information (col.6, lines36-67, fig.1). It would have obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Paradox, and Kessler, because of all the reasons found in Kessler including immediately and accurately report the exact nature of services rendered to a patient (col.5, lines 1-31).

Regarding independent claim 105, Paradox discloses a design layout box for creating a form, containing various disjointed fields-- *to present a graphical user interface (GUI) comprising two disjoint sets of labeled fields, a first set and a second set, wherein both the first and second sets are non-empty sets* (pages 184-187, 191-197, fig.8.1).

Moreover, Paradox teaches saving the generated form. The form contains descriptive textual read-only fields, and blank spaces to accept input data from a user into those spaces -- *wherein the labeled fields belonging to the first set are allowed to accept first data, and the labeled fields belonging to second set are allowed to accept second data, wherein the generated file is comprised of individually identifiable data fields filled with the first data and of individually identifiable data fields filled with the second data* (pages 229-230, 184-187, fig.8.1, 8.2). Paradox fails to explicitly disclose *to generate a file, transmittable to a selected one of M possible recipients, from data entered into at least some of the labeled fields,* *wherein the file format for the generated file is selected from a predetermined set of R file formats, responsive to the first data entered into the first set of labeled fields, wherein R is an integer equal to or greater than two and M is an integer equal to or greater than two.* However, Kessler teaches the transmission of a completed form containing insurance, and diagnostic code information to end users (col.6, lines 1-67, fig.1). It would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Paradox, and Kessler, because of all the reasons found in Kessler including

immediately and accurately report the exact nature of services rendered to a patient (col.5, lines 1-31).

Regarding claim 106, which depends on claim 105, Paradox teaches saving the generated form. The form contains descriptive textual read-only fields, such as address, contact fields, having two fields (pages 229-230, fig.8.1). Paradox fails to explicitly disclose *the selected one of the M recipients is selected by entering an unique identifier corresponding to the selected one of the M recipients into a field in the first set of labeled fields*. However, Kessler teaches a form containing insurance, and diagnostic code information (col.6, lines36-67, fig.1). It would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Paradox, and Kessler, because of all the reasons found in Kessler including immediately and accurately report the exact nature of services rendered to a patient (col.5, lines 1-31).

Regarding claim 107, which depends on claim 105, Paradox teaches saving the generated form. The form contains descriptive textual read-only fields, such as address, contact fields, having two fields (pages 229-230, fig.8.1). Paradox fails to explicitly disclose *each of the M recipients has associated therewith a unique portion of the computer software*. However, Kessler teaches a form containing payee, payor identifiers (col.6, lines36-67, fig.1). It would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Paradox, and Kessler, because of all the reasons found in Kessler including immediately and accurately report the exact nature of services rendered to a patient (col.5, lines 1-31).

Regarding claim 108, which depends on claim 107, Paradox teaches saving the generated form. The form contains descriptive textual read-only fields, such as address, contact fields, having two fields (pages 229-230, fig.8.1). Paradox fails to explicitly disclose *the unique portion of the computer software associated with each of the M recipients contains information specifying the file format to be used for files generated for transmission to that recipient.* However, Kessler teaches a form containing payee, payor identifiers to be transmitted to recipients (col.6, lines36-67, fig.1). It would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Paradox, and Kessler, because of all the reasons found in Kessler including immediately and accurately report the exact nature of services rendered to a patient (col.5, lines 1-31).

Regarding claim 109, which depends on claim 107, Paradox teaches saving the generated form. The form contains descriptive textual read-only fields, such as address, contact fields, having two fields (pages 229-230, fig.8.1). Paradox fails to explicitly disclose *the unique portion of the computer software associated with each of the M recipients is updated: as the file requirements of that particular recipient change; independent of the other M recipients; and independent of a sender of the transmitted file.* . However, Kessler teaches a form containing payee, payor identifiers (col.6, lines36-67, fig.1). It would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Paradox, and Kessler, because of all the reasons found in Kessler including immediately and accurately report the exact nature of services rendered to a patient by including the correct data (col.5, lines 1-31).

Regarding claim 110, which depends on claim 107, Paradox teaches saving the generated form. The form contains descriptive textual read-only fields, such as address, contact fields, having two fields (pages 229-230, fig.8.1). Paradox fails to explicitly disclose *the unique portion of the computer software associated with each of the M recipients is accessed and updated by that recipient independently of the remaining M recipients and independently of a sender of the transmitted file.* . However, Kessler teaches a form containing payee, payor identifiers (col.6, lines36-67, fig.1). It would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Paradox, and Kessler, because of all the reasons found in Kessler including immediately and accurately report the exact nature of services rendered to a patient by including the correct data (col.5, lines 1-31).

Regarding claim 111, which depends on claim 105, Paradox teaches saving the generated form. The form contains descriptive textual read-only fields, such as address, contact fields, having two fields (pages 229-230, fig.8.1). Paradox fails to explicitly disclose *at least some of the data in the identifiable fields of the transmittable file generated can be digitally transferred from the generated file to associated fields of a software application at the selected one of the M recipients* . However, Kessler teaches a device for the transmission a form containing payee, payor identifiers (col.6, lines36-67, fig.1). It would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Paradox, and Kessler, because of all the reasons found in Kessler including immediately and accurately report the exact nature of services rendered to a patient by including the correct data (col.5, lines 1-31).

Regarding claim 112, which depends on claim 111, Paradox teaches saving the generated form. The form contains descriptive textual read-only fields, such as address, contact fields, having two fields (pages 229-230, fig.8.1). Paradox fails to explicitly disclose *at least some of the data in the identifiable fields of the transmittable file generated can be digitally transferred from the generated file to associated fields of a software application at the selected one of the M recipients without imposing a standard on the transmittable file which forces every one of the M recipients to accept files with the same file format as files generated for all the other M recipients.* However, Kessler teaches a device for the transmission a form containing payee, payor identifiers (col.6, lines36-67, col. 8, lines 14-67, fig.1). It would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Paradox, and Kessler, because of all the reasons found in Kessler including immediately and accurately report the exact nature of services rendered to a patient by including the correct data (col.5, lines 1-31).

Regarding claim 113, which depends on claim 105, Paradox teaches saving the generated form. The form contains descriptive textual read-only fields, such as address, contact fields, having two fields (pages 229-230, fig.8.1). Paradox fails to explicitly disclose *wherein a sender of the transmitted file can generate the transmittable file wherein at least some of the data in the identifiable fields of the transmittable file generated can be digitally transferred from the generated file to associated fields of a software application at the selected one of the M without said recipient divulging to the sender specifications of its information system.* However, Kessler teaches a device for the transmission a form containing payee, payor identifiers (col.6, lines36-67, fig.1). It would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Paradox, and

Kessler, because of all the reasons found in Kessler including immediately and accurately report the exact nature of services rendered to a patient by including the correct data (col.5, lines 1-31).

Regarding claim 114, which depends on claim 105, Paradox teaches saving the generated form. The form contains descriptive textual read-only fields, such as address, contact fields, having two fields (pages 229-230, fig.8.1). Paradox, and Kessler fail to explicitly disclose *the M recipients and a sender of the transmitted file operate independent computer systems.* However, Kessler teaches a device for the transmission a form containing payee, payor identifiers using available data transmission system (col.6, lines36-67, col.8, lines 14-67, fig.1). It would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Paradox, and Kessler, because of all the reasons found in Kessler including immediately and accurately report the exact nature of services rendered to a patient by including the correct data using available data systems (col.5, lines 1-31).

Regarding claim 115, which depends on claim 105, Paradox teaches saving the generated form. The form contains descriptive textual read-only fields, such as address, contact fields, having two fields (pages 229-230, fig.8.1). Paradox fails to explicitly disclose *the GUI provides a single universal interface between a sender of the transmitted file and the M recipients.* However, Kessler teaches a device for the transmission a form containing payee, payor identifiers (col.6, lines36-67, fig.1). It would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Paradox, and Kessler, because of all the reasons found in Kessler including

immediately and accurately report the exact nature of services rendered to a patient by including the correct data (col.5, lines 1-31).

Regarding claim 116, which depends on claim 105, Paradox teaches saving the generated form. The form contains descriptive textual read-only fields, such as address, contact fields, having two fields (pages 229-230, fig.8.1). Paradox fails to explicitly disclose *the computer software resides on a personal computer operated by a sender of the transmitted file.* However, Kessler teaches a device for the transmission a form containing payee, payor identifiers (col.6, lines36-67, fig.1). It would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Paradox, and Kessler, because of all the reasons found in Kessler including immediately and accurately report the exact nature of services rendered to a patient by including the correct data (col.5, lines 1-31).

Regarding claim 117, which depends on claim 105, Paradox teaches saving the generated form. The form contains descriptive textual read-only fields, such as address, contact fields, having two fields (pages 229-230, fig.8.1). Paradox fails to explicitly disclose *the computer software is automatically updated whenever the file is transmitted to the one of the M recipients.* However, Kessler teaches a device for the transmission a updated form containing payee, payor identifiers to end users (col.6, lines36-67, fig.1). It would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Paradox, and Kessler, because of all the reasons found in Kessler including immediately and accurately report the exact nature of services rendered to a patient by including

the correct data (col.5, lines 1-31).

Regarding claim 118, which depends on claim 105, Paradox teaches saving the generated form. The form contains descriptive textual read-only fields, such as address, contact fields, having two fields (pages 229-230, fig.8.1). Paradox and Kessler fail to explicitly disclose *the computer software resides at a value added service on a server computer accessible to a sender of the transmitted file via the Internet.* . However, Kessler teaches a device for the transmission a form containing payee, payor identifiers (col.6, lines36-67, col.8, lines 14-67, fig.1). It would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Paradox, and Kessler, because of all the reasons found in Kessler including immediately and accurately report the exact nature of services rendered to a patient by including the correct data over available system (col.5, lines 1-31).

Regarding claim 119, which depends on claim 105, Paradox teaches saving the generated form. The form contains descriptive textual read-only fields, such as address, contact fields, having two fields (pages 229-230, fig.8.1). Paradox and Kessler fail to explicitly disclose *the generated file is transmitted from the server to the selected one of the M recipients.* However, Kessler teaches a device for the transmission a form containing payee, payor identifiers (col.6, lines36-67, col.8, lines 14-67, fig.1). It would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Paradox, and Kessler, because of all the reasons found in Kessler including immediately and accurately report the exact nature of services rendered to a patient by including

the correct data over available system (col.5, lines 1-31).

Regarding claim 120, which depends on claim 118, Paradox teaches saving the generated form. The form contains descriptive textual read-only fields, such as address, contact fields, having two fields (pages 229-230, fig.8.1). Paradox and Kessler fail to explicitly disclose *the generated file is archived on a computer permitting access to the server*. However, Kessler teaches a device for the transmission a form containing payee, payor identifiers (col.6, lines36-67, col.8, lines 14-67, fig.1). It would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Paradox, and Kessler, because of all the reasons found in Kessler including immediately and accurately report the exact nature of services rendered to a patient by including the correct data over available system (col.5, lines 1-31).

Regarding claim 121, which depends on claim 118, Paradox teaches saving the generated form. The form contains descriptive textual read-only fields, such as address, contact fields, having two fields (pages 229-230, fig.8.1). Paradox and Kessler fail to explicitly disclose *the file is completed on the server; the completed file is downloaded to the accessing computer; and the completed file is transmitted to the chosen one of the M recipients from the accessing computer*. However, Kessler teaches a device for the transmission a form containing payee, payor identifiers (col.6, lines36-67, col.8, lines 14-67, fig.1). It would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Paradox, and Kessler, because of all the reasons found in Kessler including immediately and accurately report the exact nature of services rendered to a

patient by including the correct data over available system (col.5, lines 1-31).

Regarding claim 124, which depends on claim 105, Paradox teaches saving the generated form. The form contains descriptive textual read-only fields, such as address, contact fields, having two fields (pages 229-230, fig.8.1). Paradox fails to explicitly disclose *the file generated is a transaction form-file to be transmitted to a selected one of the M recipients..* However, Kessler teaches a device for the transmission a form containing payee, payor identifiers (col.6, lines36-67, col.8, lines 14-67, fig.1). It would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Paradox, and Kessler, because of all the reasons found in Kessler including immediately and accurately report the exact nature of services rendered to a patient by including the correct data over available system (col.5, lines 1-31).

Regarding claim 125, which depends on claim 124, Paradox teaches saving the generated form. The form contains descriptive textual read-only fields, such as address, contact fields, having two fields (pages 229-230, fig.8.1). Paradox fails to explicitly disclose *the generated file corresponds to a health insurance claim form .* However, Kessler teaches a device for the transmission a form containing payee, payor identifiers (col.6, lines36-67, col.8, lines 14-67, fig.1). It would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Paradox, and Kessler, because of all the reasons found in Kessler including immediately and accurately report the exact nature of services rendered to a patient by including the correct data over available system (col.5, lines 1-31).

Regarding claim 126, which depends on claim 125, Paradox teaches saving the generated form. The form contains descriptive textual read-only fields, such as address, contact fields, having two fields (pages 229-230, fig.8.1).

Regarding claim 127, which depends on claim 105, Paradox teaches saving the generated form. The form contains descriptive textual read-only fields, such as address, contact fields, having two fields (pages 229-230, fig.8.1). Paradox fails to explicitly disclose *the first set of labeled fields contains two fields wherein a first labeled field requests a unique identifier associated with a health insurance payer and wherein a second labeled field request a unique code associated with a medical procedure.* However, Kessler teaches a device for the transmission a form containing payee, payor identifiers (col.6, lines36-67, col.8, lines 14-67, fig.1). It would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Paradox, and Kessler, because of all the reasons found in Kessler including immediately and accurately report the exact nature of services rendered to a patient by including the correct data over available system (col.5, lines 1-31).

Regarding claim 128, which depends on claim 127, Paradox teaches saving the generated form. The form contains descriptive textual read-only fields, such as address, contact fields, having two fields *once the first and second labeled fields of the first set of fields have been populated with respective data,* (pages 229-230, fig.8.1). Paradox fails to explicitly disclose *the remaining labeled fields of the GUI identify additional data the health insurance payer requires to support the claim for the specified medical procedure.* However, Kessler teaches a device for

the transmission a form containing payee, payor identifiers (col.6, lines36-67, col.8, lines 14-67, fig.1). It would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Paradox, and Kessler, because of all the reasons found in Kessler including immediately and accurately report the exact nature of services rendered to a patient by including the correct data over available system (col.5, lines 1-31).

Regarding claim 129, which depends on claim 105, Paradox teaches saving the generated form. The form contains descriptive textual read-only fields, such as address, contact fields, having two fields (pages 229-230, fig.8.1). Paradox, and Kessler fail to explicitly disclose *at least one of the labeled fields of the second set of labeled fields accepts a computer file.*

. However, Kessler teaches a device for the transmission a form containing payee, payor identifiers (col.6, lines36-67, col.8, lines 14-67, fig.1). It would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Paradox, and Kessler, because of all the reasons found in Kessler including immediately and accurately report the exact nature of services rendered to a patient by including the correct data over available system, and to provide information on organ systems of the patient (col.5, lines 1-31, col.8, lines 1-15).

Regarding claim 130, which depends on claim 105, Paradox teaches saving the generated form. The form contains descriptive textual read-only fields, such as address, contact fields, having two fields (pages 229-230, fig.8.1). Paradox, and Kessler fail to explicitly disclose *at least one of the labeled fields of the second set of labeled fields accepts a digital image.* However, Kessler teaches a device for the transmission a form containing payee, payor

identifiers (col.6, lines36-67, col.8, lines 14-67, fig.1). It would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Paradox, and Kessler, because of all the reasons found in Kessler including immediately and accurately report the exact nature of services rendered to a patient by including the correct data over available system, and to provide information on organ systems of the patient (col.5, lines 1-31, col.8, lines 1-15).

Regarding claim 131, which depends on claim 105, Paradox teaches saving the generated form. The form contains descriptive textual read-only fields, such as address, contact fields, having two fields (pages 229-230, fig.8.1). Paradox, and Kessler fail to explicitly disclose *at least one of the labeled fields of the second set of labeled fields accepts a word processor document.* However, Kessler teaches a device for the transmission a form containing payee, payor identifiers (col.6, lines36-67, col.8, lines 14-67, fig.1). It would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Paradox, and Kessler, because of all the reasons found in Kessler including immediately and accurately report the exact nature of services rendered to a patient by including the correct data over available system, and to provide information on organ systems of the patient (col.5, lines 1-31, col.8, lines 1-15).

Regarding claim 132, which depends on claim 105, Paradox teaches saving the generated form. The form contains descriptive textual read-only fields, such as address, contact fields, having two fields (pages 229-230, fig.8.1). Paradox, and Kessler fail to explicitly *at least one of the labeled fields of the second set of labeled fields accepts a digital graph.* However, Kessler teaches a device for the transmission a form containing payee, payor identifiers (col.6, lines36-

67, col.8, lines 14-67, fig.1). It would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Paradox, and Kessler, because of all the reasons found in Kessler including immediately and accurately report the exact nature of services rendered to a patient by including the correct data over available system, and to provide information on organ systems of the patient (col.5, lines 1-31, col.8, lines 1-15).

Regarding claim 133, which depends on claim 105, Paradox teaches saving the generated form. The form contains descriptive textual read-only fields, such as address, contact fields, having two fields (pages 229-230, fig.8.1). Paradox, and Kessler fail to explicitly disclose *at least one of the labeled fields of the second set of labeled fields accepts a digital sound recording.* However, Kessler teaches a device for the transmission a form containing payee, payor identifiers (col.6, lines36-67, col.8, lines 14-67, fig.1). It would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Paradox, and Kessler, because of all the reasons found in Kessler including immediately and accurately report the exact nature of services rendered to a patient by including the correct data over available system, and to provide information on organ systems of the patient (col.5, lines 1-31, col.8, lines 1-15).

Regarding claim 134, which depends on claim 105, Paradox teaches saving the generated form. The form contains descriptive textual read-only fields, such as address, contact fields, having two fields (pages 229-230, fig.8.1). Paradox, and Kessler fail to explicitly disclose *at least one of the labeled fields of the second set of labeled fields accepts a digitized video signal.*

However, Kessler teaches a device for the transmission a form containing payee, payor identifiers (col.6, lines36-67, col.8, lines 14-67, fig.1). It would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Paradox, and Kessler, because of all the reasons found in Kessler including immediately and accurately report the exact nature of services rendered to a patient by including the correct data over available system, and to provide information on organ systems of the patient (col.5, lines 1-31, col.8, lines 1-15).

Regarding claim 135, which depends on claim 105, Paradox teaches saving the generated form. The form contains descriptive textual read-only fields, such as address, contact fields, having two fields (pages 229-230, fig.8.1). Paradox fails to explicitly disclose *wherein first and second files generated during first and second sessions initiated by a user have first and second file formats permitting at least some of the data in the respective identifiable fields to be transferred to associated fields in software applications operated by first and second ones of the M recipients, respectively.* However, Kessler teaches a device for the transmission a form containing payee, payor identifiers (col.6, lines36-67, col.8, lines 14-67, fig.1). It would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Paradox, and Kessler, because of all the reasons found in Kessler including immediately and accurately report the exact nature of services rendered to a patient by including the correct data over available system, and to provide information on organ systems of the patient (col.5, lines 1-31, col.8, lines 1-15).

Claims 139-153, 156-167 are directed towards a computer equivalent to the computer found in claims 106-120, and 124-134 respectively, and are therefore similarly rejected.

8. Claims 122-123, and 154-155 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paradox.

Regarding claim 122, which depends on claim 105, Paradox teaches generating system generated fields, such as today's date, time, etc., in a form-- *at least one field of the first subset of the second set of labeled fields is automatically filled in when data is entered into the first set of labeled fields* (pages 224). Paradox fails to explicitly disclose *a first portion of the second set of labeled fields is automatically filled in with data when the file is opened*. However, it would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Paradox, and Kessler, because of all the reasons found in Kessler including the automatic updating the form with systems' data. This would enable the quick update of the form when the file is opened.

Regarding claim 123, which depends on claim 105, Paradox teaches generating system generated fields, such as today's date, time, etc., in a form-- *at least one field of the first subset of the second set of labeled fields is automatically filled in when data is entered into the first set of labeled fields* (pages 224). Paradox fails to explicitly disclose *a second portion of the second set of labeled fields is automatically filled in with data when data is entered into the first set of labeled fields*. However, it would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Paradox, and Kessler, because of all the reasons found in Kessler including the automatic updating the form with systems' data. This would enable the quick update of the form when the

file as the user is filling out the form.

Claims 154-155 are directed towards a computer equivalent to the computer found in claims 122-123 respectively, and are therefore similarly rejected.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 2/6/2007 have been fully considered but they are moot in light of the newly rejected claims above.

Conclusion

I. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Peters et al. (Pat. # 6,999,937 B1), Freeman et al. (Pat. # 6,012,035 A), and Crane (Pat. # 5,748,907 A).

II. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (571) 272-4128. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on (571) 272-4124. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, go to <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair>. Should you have any questions about access to the Private PAIR system, please contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866 217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, please call 800-786-9199 or 571 272-1000 (USA or Canada).

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

- (571)-273-8300 (for all Formal communications intended for entry)


CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER
5/29/2007